

effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 23, 1995, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. James L. Setser of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The state official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated October 3, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated March 1, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room located at the Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia 30830.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-13103 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Review of NRC Inspection Report Content, Format, and Style

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is revising its procedures on inspection reports and requests public comment on whether the content, format and style of inspection reports as currently issued are appropriate, and how they may be improved. The NRC is soliciting comments from interested public interest groups, the regulated industry, States, and concerned citizens. Comments are requested from both reactor and materials licensees. This request is intended to assist the NRC in making the inspection report a more effective tool for communicating with the regulated industry and the public, and in meeting the NRC's responsibility for public health and safety.

DATES: The comment period expires June 29, 1995. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: David Meyers, Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publication Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: T-6D-59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laban Coblenz, Mail Stop: O-12E-4, Inspection Program Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415-2619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) has begun a review of the content, format, and style of NRC inspection reports, as a preliminary step to revising internal inspection report procedures. The review is being led by Laban Coblenz, Inspection Program Branch, NRR, and is being supplemented by contacts in other NRC Headquarters offices and the regions.

This review will attempt, through discussion, review, and consensus-building, to define the characteristics of the ideal NRC inspection report, and to revise internal procedures to produce reports meeting those characteristics. As such, it involves understanding the results of other assessments, learning from inspection report users, and evaluating the interfaces of the report with other agency processes and systems. The scope of the review applies only to documenting inspection results, and does not encompass the focus, scope, or frequency of inspections.

NRC inspection reports are primarily designed to communicate the results of an NRC inspection to the licensee inspected. They:

- (1) Briefly describe the areas inspected, with more detail given to support more significant findings;
- (2) Give general conclusions about the effectiveness of the Program or activity inspected;
- (3) Provide a basis for other NRC action, including Enforcement actions, Plant Performance Reviews, Systematic Assessments of Licensee Performance (SALPs), and other assessments.

In addition to the primary addressee, inspection reports communicate relevant information on licensee performance to other NRC offices, other licensees, public interest groups, Congressional oversight committees, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and the public. Unless exempted from public disclosure (e.g., because of containing proprietary or safeguards information), copies of NRC inspection reports are placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR).

Scope of the Review

This review will attempt to approach the NRC inspection report from two perspectives. The first is that of the initial readers—primarily the licensee to whom the report is addressed, but also the other readers listed above. This viewpoint should highlight questions such as, "Is the message clear?" "Is the information presented in a logical, consistent manner?" "Is the tone appropriate?" etc.

The second viewpoint is that of subsequent users (e.g., a manager preparing a SALP report, an inspector scanning old reports for past problems, a group of local citizens reviewing a licensee's history of issues, or an external agency evaluating the effectiveness of NRC inspection in a particular area). This viewpoint should emphasize the ease of information retrieval, consistency of format from report to report, effective report

summaries, accurate and usable cross-references, and appropriate level of detail.

Additional detail on the scope of the review is given in the questions below. Public comments are sought on these issues to assist the NRC in its review. Although the NRC is interested in as many comments as possible, commenters are not obligated to and need not address every issue.

In providing comments, please key your responses to the number of the applicable question (e.g., "Response to A.3"). Section D should be used for additional or miscellaneous comments. Comments should be as specific as possible. The use of examples is encouraged.

Comments are requested on the following specific issues:

A. Inspection Report Content

1. Focus on safety:

a. Are inspection reports appropriately focused on safety issues? Should report writers be required to articulate the safety significance of each finding?

b. Is the level of detail for a given issue generally commensurate with the significance of that issue?

c. What threshold of significance should be used to determine whether or not an observation should be documented in the inspection report? Do existing reports generally use an appropriate threshold of significance?

d. Are reports, as currently written, too negative in their focus? Should "equal time" be given to discussions of licensee strengths and successes? If so, what criteria should be used to include such findings in inspection reports?

2. Supporting Details:

a. Do inspection reports generally contain an appropriate level of detail to describe technically complex issues?

b. What level of detail should be included for describing an event when that event has already been described separately in a licensee event report?

c. What level of detail should be used to describe inspection activities when little or no findings have resulted from those activities?

d. What are the costs and benefits of including, as enclosures to the report, all referenced material to support report findings (e.g., licensee procedures, supporting calculations, or independent studies)?

3. Enforcement Issues:

a. What information should be included in inspection reports to support taking enforcement actions?

b. Are reports generally clear in stating the circumstances of the violation (e.g., what requirement was

violated, how it was violated, who identified it, etc.)?

c. Is sufficient detail generally given to substantiate enforcement-related conclusions?

d. Should all minor and non-cited violations be documented in inspection reports? What threshold should be used to determine the significance of compliance items that must be documented?

4. Clear Conclusions:

a. Are report conclusions generally well-supported by facts? Is the progression of logic generally clear?

b. Is a conclusion statement always necessary for each section of the report (e.g., when limited observations or findings were made in a given area)?

B. Inspection Report Format

1. Consistency:

a. Should inspection report formats be consistent from region to region? What benefits or problems would result from adopting a standardized report outline?

b. What are the advantages and disadvantages of combined or integrated inspection reports (e.g., one report per six weeks, per reactor site, covering all areas)?

c. When is the use of "boilerplate" appropriate (i.e., standard phrases or sentences used from report to report to describe similar inspection methods, purposes, or conclusions)? Should more or less boilerplate be used?

2. Readability:

a. What features increase or decrease a report's readability or effectiveness in communication?

b. Do you prefer a narrative or a "bulletized" appearance?

3. Usefulness:

a. What features increase or decrease the efficiency of later efforts to retrieve information from a report (e.g., for SALP reviews, regional studies, or external reviews)?

b. Are there particular parts of the report that could be deleted without decreasing the report quality or detracting from its function?

4. Report Summaries: What information should be included in a report summary? How should it be presented?

5. Cover Letters: How might cover letters be modified to express more clearly the level of concern, or to better convey a particular performance message to a licensee?

C. Inspection Report Style

1. Style variations: In what ways do variations in writing style influence the effectiveness of inspection reports?

2. NRC style: Are there particular features of standard NRC style (e.g.,

consistent use of past tense or third-person form) that make inspection reports more readable? Less readable?

3. Tone: Are inspection reports generally written in an appropriate tone?

4. Grammatical Construction: Are inspection reports generally acceptable in sentence and paragraph construction? Do they give evidence of careful proofreading?

D. Additional Comments

In addition to the above specific issues, commenters are invited to provide any other views on NRC inspection reports that could assist the NRC in improving their effectiveness.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard W. Borchardt,

Chief, Inspection Program Branch, Directorate for Inspection & Support Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-13104 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 75th meeting on June 21 and 22, 1995, in Room T-2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of portions that may be closed to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, June 21, 1995-8:30 a.m.

until 6 p.m. and

Thursday, June 22, 1995-8:30 a.m. until 4 p.m.

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Final PRA Policy Statement*—The Committee will discuss the NRC staff's proposed Probabilistic Risk Assessment Policy Statement and Implementation Plan with representatives of the NRC staff.

B. *Technical Site Suitability Process*—Representatives from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) will discuss the major elements of the technical site suitability process being applied at the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

C. *Seismic Hazard Analyses*—The Committee will review the NRC staff and Center for Nuclear Waste